DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 332 626 HE 024 589

AUTHOR Stauffer, Gregory L.
TITLE Enhancing Faculty Professional Development Opportunities through the Provision of Faculty Research Funding.
INSTITUTION Washburn Univ. of Topeka, Kans.
PUB DATE Jun 91
NOTE 29p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Faculty Development; *Financial Support; Guidelines; Higher Education; *Peer Evaluation; Productivity; Program Implementation; *Research Projects; Research Proposals; Resource Allocation
IDENTIFIERS *Washburn University of Topeka KS

ABSTRACT

With the goal of providing professional development resources for enhancing faculty research productivity, Washburn University (Kansas), which employs about 250 full-time faculty, developed a program that allocates institutional funds through a peer review process. The fund's peer review process has involved two committees, a Faculty Research Committee (FRC), and a Research Review Committee (RRC). The FRC, an umbrella committee of 10 members responsible for the dispersal of funds, has met monthly to review "small" grant requests (under $2,000) and to review recommendations from the RRC. The RRC has been primarily responsible for reviewing "large" funding requests (over $2,000) and making recommendations regarding those requests to the FRC. Proposal guidelines for small and large grants have been developed over the lifetime of the fund. Conflicts have developed over the desire for more detail and additional guidelines versus the desire to reduce complexity and paper work. In addition, once the funds are allocated, the recipients have received no further support for coping with institutional personnel and purchasing procedures. Included are program guidelines for both small and large proposals, a five-item bibliography and an appendix containing a major research grant proposal application form. (JB)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

ED332626

# ENHANCING FACULTY PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT OPPORTUNITIES THROUGH THE PROVISION OF FACULTY RESEARCH FUNDING

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Gregory L. Stauffer

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

By Gregory L Stauffer, EdD
Assistant Vice President for Academic Affairs
Washburn University

June 1991

HE024581

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

# ENHANCING FACULTY PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT OPPORTUNITIES THROUGH THE PROVISION OF FACULTY RESEARCH FUNDING

## INTRODUCTION

Faculty professional development activities provide the opportunity "both to maintain and to improve the professional competence of individual faculty" (Mathis, 1982, p 646). Institutions are in a position to encourage developmental activities in the research component of a faculty member's duties through allocation of resources in a supportive manner. This encouragement does not mean that all members of the professorate will be able or inclined to take advantage of the support made available, nor is that necessary. However, resource availability can prove beneficial in enhancing the productivity levels of the vast majority of faculty.

"Cumulative advantage" is provided as one explanation for research productivity (Creswell, 1985). The term has been coined to describe a situation whereby a faculty member [cumulatively] increases his or her opportunities for additional successes based on past successes. A key ingredient in the acquisition of cumulative advantage is access to the resources necessary to be a productive researcher (Long & McGinnis, 1981). Institutional administrators can, through provision of resources

and assignments, create an atmosphere which enables faculty to begin accumulation of such advantage.

Professional development programs focusing on the research component of a faculty member's duties might require access to such items as travel funds, released time, personnel support, materials, and equipment (Gaff, 1975; Toombs, 1975). Once an institution has made the commitment to be involved in supporting such a program, it must create a mechanism by which allocation of support can occur. The purpose of this paper is to describe one such mechanism. By creating an in-house faculty committee to review research proposals, the use of a faculty peer review process can be extended to yet another, quite appropriate, component of the academic enterprise.

## PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

What follows is a description of one institution's effort to provide professional development resources for the purpose of enhancing faculty research productivity. Individuals responsible for similar efforts at other campuses might find this description useful in developing their own models. The program recounted here was developed at an institution with an historical primary emphasis on teaching; research being of more recent importance. The university involved employs approximately 250 full-time faculty.

Described is a model that allocates institutional funds through a peer review process. Probably the one outstanding feature of the process is that it is constantly evolving. Beyond the initial administrative decision that the faculty should be responsible for choosing how research support funds are to be allocated, almost all other aspects of the program have changed with time and likely will continue to change into the future. This evolutionary process displays itself not only in the criteria used for proposal evaluation, but also in the documents and guidelines that are part of the proposal submission and review process, and in the level of financial support available for project funding.

**Institutional Professional Development Programs.** To provide an initial sense of how this research funding effort fits within the overall program of professional development opportunities available on the campus, it is helpful to have a quick understanding of the other development options available.

Faculty travel is funded at the individual school/college level. Travel funds are available for presentation of scholarly papers; service as a panelist, an officer, or a session chair; or attendance at various conferences and association meetings. The level of funding available to support such activity depends upon the school involved and the type of participation. As is the case at most all institutions, the amount

of funds availabe for this purpose is never enough to meet all the needs.

Curriculum development projects are funded through the creation of a relatively recently established Curriculum Development Committee. This Committee, which in some ways parallels the Faculty Research Committee described in the present paper, is comprised of faculty members interested in curriculum development efforts. Through funds allocations from this program, faculty can develop new courses or course materials or enhance existing courses or curricula. All types of expenses are potentially allowable, the one proviso is that funding proposals must relate either to the general core area or to the specific disciplines present at the institution. In this way, projects requesting curriculum development funding must be able to fairly directly demonstrate institutional value for the investment.

Released time/leaves/sabbaticals, etc. represent yet additional types of professional development possibilities present. Most of these options are quite similar to what is available at other institutions, some of the programs are unique to the campus described in this report. The important point is simply that these traditional types of opportunities are also available.

Despite the above-mentioned programs, one area of professional development opportunities for faculty still needed enhancement. While

departmental funds would pay for the outcomes of research effort (conference attendance, presentations, etc), the institution was providing little monetary support for the research effort itself. As in any institution, some members of the faculty receive external grant funding for their research activities. However, this avenue is but marginally available because the institution only sporadically has had in place a separate institutional research office and officer to help faculty in receiving such funding. To better assist faculty in their research efforts, the institution therefore decided to commit to providing in-house funding to support such activity.

**Evolution of the Research Fund.** Much has transpired in taking the research fund from its early developmental stage to its present status. This evolutionary process should be seen as encouraging to those individuals desiring to establish a similar fund on their own campus. Even a quite modest beginning can, with time and effort, develop into a program quite helpful in cultivating faculty research activity. Lessons also can be learned and mistakes avoided through studying the efforts of others who have faced similar issues. It is with that thought that this section reviews evolution of the research fund.

For the first several years of its existence, the research committee had very limited resources available to allocate. An institutional fund of $25,000 does not cover a great deal of activity for a faculty of 250. However, financial resources were tight enough that more could not be

quickly appropriated. Instead, administrative leadership took the position that though no immediate improvement in funding levels was possible, a commitment to the program should be demonstrated to the faculty. With this goal in mind, a commitment was made to increase the level of funding for research over a three-year period. Available funding was increased in $25,000 increments for three fiscal years, from $25K to $50K to $75K to $100K, until the current level was reached. [Table 1 displays the exact figures.] On a "per faculty" basis this represented an increase of from $100 to $400/yr of support. In that many members of the faculty do not access the fund, those that do are now able to receive a good portion of the resources needed. (Please be reminded that other funding sources for professional development activities are available on the campus as well.)

Guidelines established relative to the research fund, and those activities that will be considered potentially acceptable for funding support, have also evolved with time. Early determination was made that proposals would only be accepted from full-time faculty members. The Committee has also determined that it will not fund graduate research work, nor will it fund travel expenses for conference attendance or paper presentations. (These expenses were considered to be the obligation of departmental budgets.) At a time when access to computers was more limited, the Committee decided that any computers purchased would become part of a general pool available for assignment, and would not be bought and permanently assigned to specific individuals. The

**TABLE 1**

**GROWTH IN FACULTY RESEARCH FUND**

| Fiscal Year | Original Budget | Total Expenditures |
|---|---|---|
| 1985-86 | $ 27,363 | $ 25,170 |
| 1986-87 | 27,910 | 25,270 |
| 1987-88 | 27,910 | 22,428 |
| 1988-89 | 53,328 | 39,570 |
| 1989-90 | 75,000 | 68,573 |
| 1990-91 | 100,000 | 78,623* |

Notes:
1990-91 "Total Expenditures" figure represent funds *allocated* eleven months into the fiscal year. A figure for final expenditures will not be available yet for several months.

The 1990-91 allocation provided, through the first eleven months, full or partial funding for 56 different grant projects.

above represent just a few of the many examples that could be cited where standards now existing have been created as part of an evolving process, resulting from review of research proposals. Each institution will work out its own guidelines to best meet its own unique needs, but the important first step is simply to get the project started.

**A Faculty Process.** The model for in-house funding of faculty research efforts discussed here is very much one that is a faculty process. From the earliest stages in the creation of an institutional program to enhance research efforts, it was determined that faculty members were the appropriate individuals to evaluate and rule upon proposal requests. Faculty from across the campus comprise the current makeup of the group charged with the task of proposal review.

Communication with faculty throughout the year is another important component of the in-house research fund. Periodically, correspondence is sent to all members of the general faculty, apprising them of funding opportunities available along with guidelines and important deadline dates. Additional communications have appeared in such in-house publications as an academic affairs newsletter and grants office publications. Members of the research committees are also asked to "spread the word" concerning available opportunities. When faculty forward research proposals for consideration, they receive a letter acknowledging committee receipt of the proposal. At the point that action is taken, the faculty member involved receives an additional

letter stating either how to proceed in order to access the approved grant funding (if funded), or reasons why the proposal was rejected (if not funded). Faculty with funded grants also receive regular reports from the business office detailing the financial status of their grant activity.

**Structure of the Program.** The faculty research fund, allocated as a result of peer review, is broken into two parts. The umbrella committee for the dispersal of funds is called the Faculty Research Committee (FRC). A subcommittee reporting to the FRC deals with specific, "major" funding requests and is called the Research Review Committee (RRC). Both groups are described below.

*Faculty Research Committee.* The in-house faculty research fund presently receives an annual allocation of $100,000 for distribution purposes. The faculty have chosen to divide this allocation in a fashion to provide funding for what are called "small" and "major" research grants. The current financial parameter (and this changes almost annually) designating the distinction between the two types of grants is $2,000. Proposals requesting less than this amount are called small research grant requests and are reviewed by the FRC, proposals of from $2,000 to $10,000 are labeled major research grant requests and are reviewed first by the RRC and then the FRC. Proposal requirements for major grants are much more extensive. Major grant application and

review is described more fully in the Research Review Committee section of this paper.

The Faculty Research Committee is comprised of ten members. Seven of the members are full-time faculty who represent specific schools/ colleges within the institution. An eighth member is a librarian with faculty status. The final two members are the Vice Presidents for Administration and Academic Affairs (or their designees). The VPAA chairs the Committee.

Small grant funding (up to $2,000) is available to fund such expense items as travel, equipment, supplies, release time, publication costs, and personnel assistance. This funding is provided for the purpose of supporting scholarly activity efforts. The FRC does not review/support requests for funding of graduate course work, dissertation research, or development of new course materials. [Table 2 displays the current guidelines for small research grant requests.]

The Faculty Research Committee meeets periodically, as necessary, to review requests for small grant funding. Typically, these meetings occur at least once a month during the fall/spring academic terms, less often in the summer months. The FRC established a set of "guidelines" (see Table 2) in the recent past in order to clarify what comprises an acceptable proposal, thereby attempting to expedite the individual faculty member's proposal process.

---

**TABLE 2**

**SMALL RESEARCH GRANT GUIDELINES**

---

These guidelines are an attempt to clarify the application instructions found in the faculty handbook and to give insight into the decision making process of the Research Committee. Not all of these guidelines will apply to every grant request, and there may be information unique to a request that should be included in the application. Try to provide enough justifying information to avoid a delay in approval of your application because the Committee feels the need for additional information.

REQUESTS FOR PREPARING A MANUSCRIPT (BOOK, JOURNAL): Prepare a brief prospectus which includes title, contents, purpose, significance, publisher, audience and all authors, emphasizing the applicant's role.

REQUESTS FOR SUPPORT OF A PROJECT: Provide a brief synopsis which includes the following items: descriptive title, purpose, significance, hypothesis, methodology, function of investigators, and possible publication, performance, or exhibit avenues. If equipment is requested, comment on how it will be used to support the project, current availability of similar equipment, and its uniqueness to the project.

REQUESTS FOR REPRINT AND/OR PAGE CHARGES: Provide the title, authors and their affiliation, the journal citation, acknowledgment of the article acceptance, and an invoice or copy of your personal check.

BUDGET DETAILS APPLICABLE TO ALL REQUESTS: The budget should be well thought out with details and justification provided. For example, what is being copied, how many copies, and the cost per copy. Travel requests should include the particulars such as the number of days to be traveled, the number of overnights, cost of lodging and meals per day, miles traveled per day as well as total mileage, the dates of travel, and any airline trips and expenses. The business office should be contacted to obtain information on budget items, such as, current travel reimbursement rates, student and employee rates of pay.

If you have previously received funds for this project from the Research Committee, please indicate the amount and date received.

---

*Research Review Committee*. The Research Review Committee reviews proposals for projects requesting between $2,000 and $10,000. The RRC makes its recommendations to the Faculty Research Committee, who in turn recommends to the Vice President for Academic Affairs. The VPAA sends his/her recommendation on to the President for final approval. Thus, the approval process for major grant requests is significantly more arduous than for small grant requests. [Table 3 displays the current guidelines for major research grant requests.]

Research Review Committee membership includes five full-time, tenured faculty members at the rank or associate or full professor. These individuals must demonstrate a documented history of research or scholarly activity in order to be allowed to serve on the RRC. Again, all academic areas of the institution have representation. The VPAA serves as an ex officio member of this subcommittee to the FRC.

Major grant funding is available both in the form of "seed" money for development of projects that will be submitted to external agencies for more extensive funding and for support "in full or in part" of original research and scholarly activity. Allowable expenses are similar to those described in the small grant section. One primary difference is that faculty can request funding from this source even while on a sabbatical.

---

**TABLE 3**

**MAJOR RESEARCH GRANT GUIDELINES**

---

I. PURPOSE AND SCOPE

The MRGF has been established to support two general types of faculty research activity: 1) development of ideas or projects to be submitted to other agencies for more extensive funding, and 2) research or scholarly activity. Requests for funding should be submitted to the Research Committee through the Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs. The Committee will consider requests for funds to cover expenses associated with research and scholarly activity which may result in publishable works and in the advancement of arts, humanities, sciences, and professions. Allowable expenses include the following types of items: travel, equipment, assistants, services, and released time (under special conditions). Requests will be considered for activities that are conducted at any time including academic and summer sabbaticals. The Committee will not consider requests for development of new courses, course materials supporting graduate work, dissertation research, or the purchase of reprints. Generally, the Committee will only consider requests between a minimum of $2,000 and the maximum of 10% of the total annual budget. (See the Faculty Handbook, Section I, VI.B.2., pp 13-16 for additional information.)

II. CONDITIONS FOR RELEASED TIME

In order for released time to be an acceptable funded item, the following conditions must be met:

1. Before considering release time, the Research Committee must have a statement approved by the Chairperson and Dean explaining how the department or school will handle the faculty member's teaching load if the grant is approved.

2. The proposal on its research and scholarly merits must be judged worthy of support by the Research Committee.

3. The released time must be necessary for completion of the research.

4. The time needed for research on the project must surpass the normal expected time allotment by the full-time faculty member to scholarly activities.

**TABLE 3**
**MAJOR RESEARCH GRANT GUIDELINES** (con't.)

III. APPLICATION AND EVALUATION PROCEDURE

The Research Committee has appointed an MRGF proposal Review Committee, which evaluates proposals twice annually, and recommends obligation of up to approximately 50% of the available annual funds. Therefore, proposals should be submitted as early as possible before the submission deadline each semester. The 1990-91 deadlines are November 5 and March 16, respectively. (Please note this change.)

After evaluation of the proposals received before each submission deadline, the Review committee will make recommendations regarding funding to the Research Committee. The Research Committee will then make its recommendations to the Vice President for Academic Affairs, who shall in turn make recommendations to the President.

IV. THE PROPOSAL

A proposal comprises four major sections: Cover Sheet, Detailed Budget, Narrative, and Appendix (or Appendices). Proposals should closely follow this format in order to facilitate a fair and thorough review and evaluation.

A. Cover Sheet: The cover sheet is provided with the proposal guidelines and should be submitted as the first page of the proposal. Note that proposals involving a request for released time require a plan on how the department or school will handle the released time. This statement must be approved by the chairperson and dean.

B. Detailed Budget: The second page of the proposal should be the budget sheet (provided with the proposal guidelines). Detail all anticipated expenses which are to be covered by funds from the MRGF grant. Attach additional sheets if necessary to clearly explain the need for requested expenditures.

C. Narrative: The narrative presents most of the important information in the proposal. It should be comprehensive, concise, and clear. Remember that the reviewers may not be familiar with your particular jargon, and that use of jargon may obscure rather than clarify your ideas. Any tables, or figures which are necessary for the presentation of your proposal should be included as appendices, and animal research subjects must also show compliance with the federal, state, and local laws governing research involving human and animal

**TABLE 3**
**MAJOR RESEARCH GRANT GUIDELINES** (con't.)

research subjects (see Faculty Handbook, Appendices IV and V, pp. 135-143 for additional information). This information may be included in the narrative or in an appendix. Funding is contingent upon approval of the Institutional Review Board. Applications for project approval are available in MO 208, Office of Vice President for Academic Affairs.

While it is not possible to anticipate all specific proposals, it is the judgement of the Review Committee that there are several important features of all potential proposals could be objectively assesed to help determine the relative merit of a proposal. Accordingly, the narrative should be written following the outline below. This outline has been specifically designed to be the basis of the evaluation process. Since the terms used to identify each part of the narrative will not have the same meaning for each person, a list of sample questions has been included to help clarify the requested information. The list of sample questions is NOT an exhaustive list. It should not be interpreted as a restriction of information supplied. These questions would clearly be relevant to some proposals, but may not always be relevant, and should therefore be interpreted as suggestions, and not necessarily as requirements.

1. Description and Nature of the Research Project. In what activities will you be engaged? Will other people participate? What is the rationale for the proposed research? Is there any relevant background information which would help the reviewers place the proposed project in perspective? How will the project be implemented? Where will the activities take place? How does the proposed project fit in with an existing body of knowledge? How will you comply with requirements for treatment of subjects? How will informed consent be secured? Etc.

2. Goal/Purpose of the Research. What hypotheses will be tested? What questions do you hope to answer? What predictions will be made? What experimental results are anticipated? What product/entity will result from the project? Etc.

**TABLE 3**
**MAJOR RESEARCH GRANT GUIDELINES** (con't.)

3. Project Significance/Professional Contribution. What is the potential professional significance of the proposed research? What is the anticipated contribution to your discipline? How will the project advance the body of knowledge in your discipline? How might the results of the project enhance the quality of life for humankind? Etc.

4. Implementation Schedule. What is the anticipated schedule of activities? When will the project be completed? Will your activities be contingent on the acquisition of equipment or materials? Etc.

5. Evaluation Plan. What criteria will be used to determine whether or not the goal of the project was achieved? What sort of statistical evaluation might be appropriate? Are there potential publication outlets for the results? Will you attempt to measure or ascertain the professional impact of this project? Etc.

D. Appendix (Appendices). The appendix should always include a current vita (resume') complete with your academic credentials, professional activities, and a summary of your research interests and activities.

V. PROPOSAL PREPARATION

The first two pages of the proposal should always be the Cover Sheet and the Detailed Budget (provided with the information packet). The Narrative portion of the proposal should always conform to the preparation guidelines with respect to both the order and content of each section. Please endeavor to limit the length of the narrative to the typewriting space available on the application form. Please avoid unnecessary jargon or technical language in drafting the narrative.

VI. FINAL REPORT

Recipients of major grants are required to submit final reports on their projects within a year following notification of the grant awards.

The Research Review Committee meets once each semester, ranking all major grant proposals received as to merit. The RRC provides a list of guidelines for faculty to follow in the proposal process as well as a specific application form to be completed. [This application form appears in Appendix A.] Each application proposal must include a cover sheet, a detailed budget, a narrative section (which includes description and nature of the research project, goal/ purpose of the research, project signficance, implementation schedule, and evaluation plan), and an appendix (or appendices). The Review Committee uses a standard "reviewer form" (see Appendix B) to evaluate all major grant requests. The RRC requires that recipients of major research grant funding provide a final report of their project efforts upon its completion.

## CONCLUSION

The in-house professional development program described in this paper has been a helpful source of research support for faculty members desirous of being advantaged by its availability. The funding has provided and continues to provide much needed assistance for various research projects. A struggle has developed however between the competing desires of providing more information, more guidelines, and more detail on the one hand; with that of reducing the complexity and paperwork of the system on the other. Additionally, the program in its

present state exists primarily as a funding "source" for research efforts in much the same way as other, external grant funding sources. Once resources are assigned, the faculty member - outside any help they may be able to garner at the departmental level - is mostly "on their own" in navigating the bureaucratic maze that can make up an institution's personnel and purchasing procedures. This too is a subject of current debate.

Thus, while this research support program has been a benefit for the faculty, it can still be improved. Individuals looking at this model for ideas should be encouraged by what that represents. As institutions create their own professional development programs, helpful pieces from models such as this one can be assimilated without destroying the uniqueness of their own situation. It is not a great issue that programs created on other campuses not match this or any other model exactly. The models themselves are moving targets. Of far greater importance is that the effort be made to establish development opportunities for the purpose of enhancing professional competencies.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY


Creswell, J. (1985). Faculty research performance: lessons from the sciences and the social sciences. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No.4. Washington, D.C.: Association for the Study of Higher Education, 1985.

Gaff, J. (1975). Toward faculty renewal. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Long, J. & McGinnis, R. (1981). Organizational context and scientific productivity. American Sociological Review, 46(422-442).

Mathis, B. (1982). Faculty development. In H. Mitzel (Ed.), Encyclopedia of Educational Research (pp. 646-655). New York: The Free Press.

Toombs, W. (1975). A three-dimensional view of faculty development. Journal of Higher Education, 46(6), 701-717.

## APPENDIX A

## MAJOR RESEARCH GRANT PROPOSALS: APPLICATION FORM

_____

(Name) (Title of Position)

Brief Descriptive Title of Proposed Research: _____

_____

_____

_____

Abstract of Proposed Research (The abstract should present the rationale of the research, the methods to be used, its objective, and an estimate of the significance to the field of research if the objective is reached.)

Proposed research requires the use of human or animal research subjects (Funding is contingent upon approval of the Institutional Review Board)

Yes ____ No ____

Amount Requested: _____ (minimum of $ 2,000)

| LEAVE BLANK | |
|---|---|
| Number | Date Received |
| | |

_____ _____

(Signature of Applicant) (Date)

_____ _____

*Department Chairperson *Dean of School or College

* Dean's initials indicate acknowledgement of proposal submission. Signature of both the Chairperson and Dean required if released time requested and approved.

o Applicant must submit the original Grant Application Form and five additional complete sets prepared by whatever copying means are available.

o Applicant will receive an acknowledgement of the proposal within one week from the Academic Affairs Office.

Detailed Budget

Although a grantee can be allowed budget flexibility after a grant is awarded, an outline of the projected use of grant funds being requested will aid in the evaluation of the proposal. Justification for budget items should be summarized on an attached page, or included in the narrative. Please itemize anticipated expenditures under each of the following categories:

1. Released Time _____

2. Assistances/Services _____

3. Travel _____

4. Equipment _____

5. Supplies _____

6. Other Expenses _____

Total Requested _____

If your project will require the expenditure of funds in more than one University fiscal year, please separate the amounts which will be needed from each year's budget.

Fiscal Year _____ Amount Requested _____

Fiscal Year _____ Amount Requested _____

Narrative

The narrative should enlarge upon the salient points presented in the \bstract. It should be as concise as is consistent with an adequate presentation and justification of the research idea. Organize your proposal in such a way that it conforms to the areas indicated below.

A. Description and Nature of the Research

B. Goal of the Research

C. Project Significance/Contribution to Discipline

D. Implementation Schedule

E. Evaluation Plan

## APPENDIX B

## MAJOR RESEARCH GRANT PROPOSALS: REVIEWER FORM

Proposal #_____

MAJOR RESEARCH GRANTS FUND
REVIEWER FORM

The proposal conforms to the MRGF guidelines governing type of projects to be funded.
YES_____ NO_____ MAYBE_____

Comments:

The proposal has made adequate provision for treatment of human or animal subjects.
NOT APPLICABLE_____ YES_____ NO_____ MAYBE_____

Preparation and Presentation of the Proposal

| (The check mark indicates rater's degree of agreement with statement) | Disagree 1 | 2 | Agree 3 | 4 | Comments |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. The proposal provides an explicit and clear description of the proposed project. | | | | | |
| 2. There is an explicit and clear statement of the goal(s) of the proposed research. | | | | | |
| 3. The proposal explicitly states the potential professional contribution and/or significance of the proposed research. | | | | | |
| 4. The description of the implementation schedule suggests the activities have been carefully planned. | | | | | |
| 5. The evaluation plan was made explicit. | | | | | |

Suggestions for improvement of proposal preparation/presentation:

Perceived Project Merit

| | Disagree 1 | 2 | Agree 3 | 4 | Comments |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 6. The information provided in the proposal suggests that the proposed activity is reasonable, and an appropriate way to pursue the research. | | | | | |
| 7. The proposed research activity is likely to achieve the stated goals. | | | | | |
| 8. Assessment of the potential significance of the activity is fair. | | | | | |
| 9. The proposed implementation schedule is realistic. | | | | | |
| 10. The proposed evaluation plan was logical and appropriate for the proposed activity. | | | | | |

Suggested changes which could improve the proposal:

RATING CRITERIA

7 - Clearly a most outstanding proposal; one which definitely should be funded.

6 - Very good proposal; one which should be funded if at all possible.

5 - Good proposal; one which is thoroughly meritorious and well above average, and which you reluctantly would see declined in a very intense competition.

4 - Average proposal; one which has merit and is worthy of support, but which demonstrates no particularly remarkable characteristics which might warrant a higher priority.

3 - Fair proposal; one which has some merit, but about which you have substantial reservations. A borderline proposal even if ample funds are available to support all "meritorious" proposals.

2 - Poor proposal; one for which you wish to provide an active negative recommendation.

1 - Clearly one of the poorest proposals.

OVERALL PROPOSAL SCORE

Initial Score
7-High 1-Low

Rater's Judgment
Before Discussion

Final Score
7-High 1-Low

Rater's Judgment
After Committee
Discussion